

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed January 11, 2006, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 29 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 9 through 13, 15, 20, 24 and 25 stand rejected. Claims 2 through 8, 14, 16 through 19, and 21 through 23 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Claims 26 through 29 have been allowed. Applicants propose to amend claims 1, 7, 12 and 17, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as proposed to be amended herein. Claims 6, 13 and 14 have been cancelled.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,713,876 to Vittu et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,927 to Glenn et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,703,598 to Muramatsu et al.

Claims 1 and 9 through 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vittu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,713,876) in view of Glenn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,455,927) and Muramatsu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,703,598). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 6, indicated to contain allowable subject matter. As such, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of independent claim 1 and claims 9 through 11 depending therefrom.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,713,876 to Vittu et al. in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,455,927 to Glenn et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,703,598 to Muramatsu et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,357,056 to Nagano

Claims 12, 13, 20, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vittu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,713,876) in view of Glenn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,455,927), Muramatsu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,703,598) and Nagano (U.S. Patent No. 5,357,056). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claim 12 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claims 13 and 14. Claim 14 has been indicated to contain allowable subject matter, and depends from claim 13. As such, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of independent claim 12 and claims 20, 24 and 25 depending therefrom. Claim 13 has been cancelled

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,713,876 to Vittu et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,927 to Glenn et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,703,598 to Muramatsu et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,357,056 to Nagano as applied to claim 12 above and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0111441 to Jerominek et al.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vittu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,713,876) in view of Glenn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,455,927), Muramatsu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,703,598) and Nagano (U.S. Patent No. 5,357,056) as applied to claim 12 above and further in view of Jerominek et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0111441). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claim 15 is allowable, among other reasons, as depending from claim 12, which should be allowed.

#### **Objections to Claims/Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 2 through 8, 14, 16 through 19, and 21 through 23 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but are indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form. Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 6. Claim 12 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 14. Claim 17 has been amended to independent form, including all of the limitations of base claim 12 prior to the present amendments thereto.

### ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The proposed amendments to claims 1, 7, 12, and 17 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search. Finally, if the Examiner determines that the amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested upon filing of a Notice of Appeal herein.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1 through 5, 7 through 12 and 15 through 29 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Kirsten L. Dockstader  
Registration No. 54,597  
Attorney for Applicants  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: March 13, 2006  
KLD/djp:slm  
Document in ProLaw